

not bring the millennium, but it would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Schwab has testified before the industrial commission that the steel trust controls 80 per cent. of the ore fields of the northwest, and has a monopoly of the Connellsville coal fields—60,000 acres in all—worth, as he said, more than \$60,000 per acre.

Ore fields and coal mines are in their nature public property. The steel trust has a right to use ore and coal. It has no right, or rather we have no right, and it is very bad policy for us to permit the steel trust to gain a monopoly of these raw materials. Property in these raw materials is so different in its nature from property which is the product of labor that public interest requires that such restrictions shall be imposed upon its acquisition that it may be freely used, but not monopolized. To prevent this monopolization, and to give capital and labor access to the raw materials, it was the proposition of Henry George to tax monopoly out of existence. For instance, if the steel trust has purchased 60,000 acres of Connellsville coal, it has done so, not because it has use for so much coal but because it seeks to prevent competitors from using it. Mr. Schwab says that the value to his corporation of this monopoly of the best coking coal in America is worth \$60,000 an acre. Then let the trust pay taxes on that valuation. As Tolstoi says, the plan is as clear as the multiplication table. Such a tax would compel speculators to let go of such coal fields as they could not use. This would give others a chance.

This reform, applied to the mines and ore fields, and applied to city lots as well—even this would not bring the millennium to us, but it would take us a long step toward the millennium, and that is all anyone claims for it. We boast that the world is better than it was. This could not be if men had not been willing to see their mistakes. Henry George has shown us a few. Let us so act that our children can boast that their world is better than ours.

LAND OWNERSHIP IN THE INDIAN TERRITORY.

For The Public.

The impending change of the Indian territory from a collection of tribal governments to a regular territory of the United States is especially interesting for several reasons. One of these is that the system of landholding therein will be altered from tribal to individual ownership. The tribal

system has been in theory a kind of communal ownership, but in practice it has fallen far short of that.

The five principal tribes of territory Indians are the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, Cherokees and Seminoles. Any member of one of these tribes has been allowed to use, rent to others, or cause to be used, as much land as he could take possession of and fence in. Had all the lands been equally valuable and unlimited this might have been equitable enough. No doubt it was as the matter stood originally. But it resulted in the rental of large tracts of land to cattlemen and business men by a small minority of shrewd Indians, and, the margin of cultivation being thus crowded down, a further result was the introduction of the rental and wage methods of employment, to the disadvantage of large numbers of duller tribesmen. Under treaties with the several tribes or "nations" made by what is called the Dawes commission, this is to be altered to the system of land-holding in severalty, prior to organization of these "nations" into a United States territory. When this is accomplished, the Indian lands, under certain partial and temporary restrictions, may be bought and sold by Indians and whites as are lands in the states of the union, and whites will have free commercial access to the territory. A large number of the Indians, and especially the full bloods, have persistently obstructed the processes of the change, holding that it was merely the culminating step in a long process by which they have been deprived of all their lands by the whites. They say that a majority of the Indians, not being accustomed to civilized business methods, and not practiced in the restraint of their desires from prudential motives, will part with their lands as soon as they are allowed to, and become paupers and charges on the community. Considering the previous policy of the government towards the Indians as wards, this is not an unreasonable contention. That policy has been such as to weaken or leave undeveloped the character of the Indian because he had means of support without much effort, sufficient unless he were of an ambitious or avaricious disposition.

It is true there will be certain safeguards thrown around the disposition of parts of the allotments, such as the setting aside of a portion of each homestead as inalienable for 21 years, not taxable, and not liable for debt. But even these portions may be sold upon determination of courts that it is for the best interest of the allottee.

Present practice already shows that in such cases where buyer and seller are agreed and the terms not too obviously flagrant, the desired exchange may be effected. There seems to be no reason for inferring that individual ownership of lands will result differently in the Indian territory from elsewhere, except as it will not result so well on account of the inexperience in commercial and competitive practices and the lack of self-restraint of the Indian.

There are, however, in one or two respects, favorable provisions for the benefit of the citizens in the system about to go into effect. In the Choctaw and Chickasaw joint reservation there are large and rich tracts of coal lands, which have hitherto been leased to mining companies by those tribes on royalties. The return from these leases has been utilized for common purposes, principally for a school fund; and has been large enough so that the schools of those nations have been of excellent character and no burden on individual earnings. Of such manifest advantage has this been that the idea will be applied to all coal, oil, asphalt or other mineral lands of the new territory. The royalties will be small (15 cents per ton of coal, 60 cents per ton of asphalt), but they may be legally advanced, and since "mineral rights" will hold precedence over certain other claims, will without doubt furnish a large and favorable source of income for common purposes. It is probable that the return from mineral lands may not be so large eventually as that from the one section in each township set aside for similar purposes in the Cherokee strip of Oklahoma, or the two sections in each township of the lands just opened in the same territory, but the principle is correct and valuable. Indeed, to one unaccustomed to our conventions about land, it would seem strange that the same principle is not applied to all the other lands of the territory. If the community has a right to take mineral values in this way, the same would apply to the values of other lands so far as those values are the product of the demand for the lands caused by the presence of communities, and not the product of individual labor in the form of improvements. Or if it is a matter of expediency, it is not apparent that it would not be well to similarly lease (or preferably tax) the unimproved values of lands of every character, allowing the Indians to choose and retain allotments under such tenure. All the dangers felt by the Indians as to the ultimate aliena-

tion of their lands would be thus obviated, and the real advantages of the common ownership to which they so closely cling, be conserved. The improvements which they might place upon homesteads, and the products of their labor, could of course be exempt. And while industry would thus be rewarded and safeguarded, and the enterprises of capital encouraged, the revenue for common purposes would no doubt render all taxation unnecessary, and make the new territory one especially well provided for as to all public institutions and benefits. We may remember that it is portions (and only portions) of such funds which are now being returned as gratuities by our Carnegies and Rockefellers for the benefit, not usually of the communities from which they are derived, but of others arbitrarily chosen.

The method of appraising the tribal lands for allotment is such as would seem to make such a system of raising revenue particularly natural and easy. Its especial feature is the valuation of all lands independent of improvements of whatever nature. Each 40 acres of land is placed in one of 19 grades of valuation, determined solely from its nature or location, and the succeeding allotment is to be according to value and not area—at once a marked improvement upon our United States homesteading laws. I am assured by Mr. Grant Foreman, chief of one of the appraisement parties (to whom I am much indebted for the facts, but not the opinions, stated here), that the process of thus valuing the lands was not made more difficult, but rather less, by leaving the improvements out of account. This is verification of a view already held by progressive economists.

But while full and logical advantage has not in this case been taken of the principle of drawing public funds from common properties, so much could hardly be expected in view of the general undeveloped state of knowledge of modern economics, and especially in view of the purely commercial instincts which usually dictate such policies as the one now organizing the new territory. It is rather a matter of congratulation to find the tendency of the times so strong as not to be ignored in a measure otherwise so heavily under the suspicion of land-grabbing selfishness. That tendency, as marked by the new practice of leasing instead of selling school lands, by the progressive taxation of landed estates in New Zealand, and by the leasing of all the lands in the German col-

ony of Kiau Chau, is having its advantages clearly illustrated.

ETHELBERT W. GRABILL.
University of South Dakota.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN.

For The Public.

Civilization involves government. Government is the power of all, delegated to a chosen number, with a view to the conservation of the rights of each, and the defense of such rights against the encroachment of any.

The existence of government involves expense.

The only source from which this expense can be met is Taxation.

Taxation means a contribution from each individual to the common fund, the amount contributed in each case being the fair and just equivalent of the benefit conferred by government.

The payment of Taxes, therefore, means the giving up to the common fund by each citizen of some portion of that which he possesses, as the price of the benefit which he obtains in the conveniences supplied and the protection afforded by government.

All that an individual possesses is included in the term, *his Rights*; and the payment of Taxes accordingly involves the relinquishment of some portion of his individual rights for the general benefit.

Individual rights are of two kinds—Natural and Legal.

Natural Rights are those liberties and authorities which a man possesses by virtue of his nature, as a being called into existence in the world by the Creator.

Legal Rights are those liberties and authorities which a man possesses by virtue of human law, which is to be regarded as expressing the consent and permission of his fellow men.

I. Amongst the Natural Rights of man may be enumerated:

1. The Right to Life, which involves:

a. The right to himself, and therefore to the use of his powers and faculties in the providing of those things which are essential to the support of life.

b. The right of access to those materials from which alone food, clothing, and shelter can be produced.

c. The right of access to the natural elements and conditions which are essential to life, such as air, water, land, sunlight, rest, sleep, etc.

d. The right to the possession and use of the product of his own toil.

2. The Right to Liberty.

a. Liberty of body, that its powers may be adequately used.

b. That he may pass from place to place and from climate to climate, as his judgment may direct.

c. Liberty of mind, that he may fully enjoy his own thoughts.

d. Liberty of speech, that he may fully express his thoughts.

3. The Right to the Pursuit of Happiness.

a. In the choice of physical surroundings.

b. In the exercise of the mental and moral powers and emotions.

c. In worshiping according to conscience, etc.

These Natural Rights are inalienable; they belong to every man without exception; they cannot be justly invaded either by other individuals or by governments; and their only limitation is that imposed by the recognition of equal natural rights in all other individuals.

II. Among the Legal Rights of man are:

1. The right to enjoy secure and peaceful possession of specific portions of land, that the same may be held or used by specific individuals, to the exclusion of all others, notwithstanding the natural right of all to all land.

2. The right to enjoy private possession of railways, telegraphs, telephones, water works, electric light plants, and other franchises, notwithstanding that in every such case a transference of authority or sovereignty on behalf of the public is necessary, in the nature of a government charter.

These Legal Rights are not inalienable; they do not belong to all individuals, but only to some; they can be justly removed or modified by the human power which has conferred them; and their limitation is the well-being of the community, as that may from time to time be determined.

Now, since Taxation is inevitable; and since it is in its very nature an invasion of Rights—being a compulsory levy on private possessions—the only question to be settled is as to which set of Rights shall be invaded.

My contention is that justice and sound policy dictate that the Legal